

Remarks

Claims 1-17 were pending in the application. Claims 1-7, 9, and 14-17 were rejected. Claims 10-13 were previously withdrawn. Claim 8 was merely objected to and no claims were allowed. By the foregoing amendment, claims 5 and 11-13 are canceled, claims 1, 6, 7, 9, and 14 are amended, and claims 18-24 are added. No new matter is presented.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 8.

Interview Summary

Applicants appreciate the courtesy of a telephone interview 11-7-2007 between the undersigned and Examiner Cocks.

Goddard was specifically discussed. Hunter, Jr. was only generally discussed as relating to sootblowers. The undersigned submitted that it was not clear that the asserted Goddard springs 42 and 124 acted to absorb any recoil of the asserted conduit 30 relative to the asserted vessel 20 and 110 in FIGs. 1 and 13. At least in FIG. 13, there appears to only be compressive recoil absorption of 110 relative to structure 123. Even in FIG. 1, if 30 were fixed relative to 26, there is no recoil of 30 relative to 20.

The undersigned submitted that it was inappropriate to apply Goddard to sootblower use and combine Goddard with sootblower references. It is one thing to apply Goddard alone to certain claims arguing that their sootblower specific elements are mere statements of intended use. It is another thing to then bootstrap the rejection of those claims as if there was in fact a suggestion to use Goddard in the sootblower art so as to then combine it with sootblower references. The undersigned submitted the present Office action has insufficient in explicit or implicit articulation of the nature and basis of any such use and/or combination.

No agreement on the merits was reached. It was agreed that the undersigned would submit an amendment/argument further distinguishing aspects of sootblower use from Goddard's and that the examiner would consider any further ground of rejection or reasoning based upon the current or further references.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 14, and 15 were rejected as being anticipated by Goddard (US2465525). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Goddard discloses a reaction combustion chamber for a rocket. The assertion at page 3 of the prior Office action that Goddard is "in the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention and as described in applicant's claims 1, 2, and 4" is clearly erroneous. The final paragraph of page 3 of the prior Office action, however, identifies the reading-out of the element of cleaning a surface within a vessel as being a statement of intended use. This raises separate issues which are further addressed by claim 17 and new claims 18-20.

Claim 5 has been incorporated into claim 1, rendering the rejection moot. A similar and amendment and further limitation from claim 11 have been incorporated into claim 14. However, the physical differences noted in the interview summary are also relevant.

New claims 21, 23, and 24 identify particular spring situations not suggested by Goddard

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The rejection suffers the same deficiency as does the underlying rejection of claim 1.

Claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard in view of Hunter, Jr. (US5494004). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The rejection suffers the same deficiency as does the underlying rejection of claim 1. Hunter, Jr. is in the sootblower art. It is, however, pure bootstrapping to combine Hunter, Jr. with the Goddard reference from a different art. Furthermore, there is no support for the proposed a la carte selection of elements from Hunter, Jr. and Goddard. There is no support for the assertion that the supports 153R and 153F of Hunter, Jr. constitute "a plurality of trolleys". Furthermore, the asserted motivation "of facilitating the advancement of the pulsed detonation device into and out of the openings of the vessel" is achieved by Hunter, Jr. alone. There is no support for the any assertion that one would have found Hunter, Jr. deficient in that regard. One simply would have used Hunter, Jr.. There is no suggestion to substitute Goddard into the sootblower art.

Within Goddard's art, It defies common sense to add trolleys to 30 which appears to be the nature of the asserted combination. The asserted analogousness of both being in combustion

does not solve this.

There also is no suggestion to seek modification of Hunter, Jr., let alone any based upon Goddard. Hunter, Jr., alone, is informative. Goddard substantially predates Hunter, Jr. Had it been obvious to adopt features of Goddard in a combustive/detonative sootblower, Hunter, Jr. would presumably have done it.

Claims 5, 9, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard in view of Boisture (US5031691). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The rejection suffers the same deficiency as does the underlying rejection of claim 1 and to the combination of Goddard and Hunter, Jr. (and moreso as noted below).

Additionally, there is clearly no suggestion to combine. Boisture relates to "cleaning the interior of several tubes within a heat exchanger bundle..." Col. 1, lines 17&18 (emphasis added). Cleaning is via high pressure water flowed through the lances. Col. 4, line 17. Clearly this is an utterly different/non-analogous art from Goddard. Although within the broad art of cleaning of industrial equipment, it is noted that the cleaning of the interiors of tubes with water is an utterly different situation from combustive cleaning (e.g., used for exterior surfaces). It is thus a non-analogous situation within a broad general art to that of the present invention.

As noted above, to the extent that the rejection involves substituting Goddard into Boisture, there is simply no suggestion and this defies common sense.

Accordingly, Applicants submits that claims 1-4, 6-10, and 14-24 are in condition for allowance. Please charge any fees or deficiency or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account of record.

Respectfully submitted,

By /William B. Slate, #37238/
William B. Slate
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 37,238

Telephone: 203-777-6628
Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: 11-08-2007